DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 825 CS 006 820

AUTHOR Ramey, Alan
TITLE Assessment Procedures of Reading Attitudes: A Survey of College and University Reading Clinics.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 42p.; M.A. Thesis, Kean College.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Reading Attitudes; *Reading Centers; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Research; *Reading Teachers; Self Evaluation (Groups); Standardized Tests; Student Attitudes; Surveys

ABSTRACT

To determine if college and university reading clinics assess students' attitudes toward reading and to discover the methods used in such assessments, questionnaires were sent to the directors of 110 reading clinics. Analysis of the data gathered from the 55 respondents revealed that a majority did assess reading attitudes and that most used inferred methods. The most popular methods of inferred assessment were the number of books independently read by students and clinician observations. Only a small percentage of the clinics reported using a standardized measure all of the time, and more than half commented that few reliable instruments existed for such assessment. The most commonly used form of assessment instrument was the student self-report, which usually involved an interview. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED220825

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES OF READING ATTITUDES: A SURVEY OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY READING CLINICS

by

Alan Ramey

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alan Ramey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted In Partial Fulfillment Of The Requirements
For The Masters Of Arts Degree
In Reading Specialization
Kean College
May, 1982

CS006820

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Statement of the Hypothesis	1
Significance of the Problem	1
Definitions	2
Assumptions Limitations and Delimitations	3
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	4
DESIGN OF THE STUDY	13
Procedures Used	13
Description of Data-gathering Instrument	13
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	16
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	24
Restatement of the Problem	24
Description of Procedures Used	24
Principle Findings and Conclusions	24
Recommendations for Further Research	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	28
APPENDIX SURVEY OF READING ATTITUDE ASSESSMENT PRACTICES	32

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

I STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Do reading clinics attempt the assessment of reading attitudes of subjects enrolled in clinical sessions, and if so, how?

II HYPOTHESIS

Fifty per cent of reading clinics do not attempt to assess the reading attitudes of their subjects.

III SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The Reading Specialist has traditionally been confronted with many children who have difficulty with the reading process - children who, for a variety of reasons, do not or will not read. In the quest to help these students, much time and energy has been spent assessing their cognitive abilities and related factors. The wise clinician learns quickly not to underestimate the affective factors - those feelings, attitudes and beliefs that have a direct bearing on student achievement. Indeed, cognitive and motivational factors have been seen as interdependent with the motivational factors considered the prime movers (Stott 1973).

Koe (1975), Summers (1977) and Stott (1973) have all reported that attitude toward reading is of vital importance to the process of reading and reading instruction. The

knowledge and nurturing of a child's attitude has a direct effect not only on whether that child will become a skilled reader, but whether that child will read at all!

Reading clinics, forever faced with the problem of the reluctant reader, must therefore logically assess not only cognitive factors, but also affective ones. Specifically they should assess attitudes toward reading. Epstein (1973) states, "If we truly desire to promote positive attitudes or at least reduce negative ones, we must at least be aware of student's present attitudes."

In recent years the study of attitude measurement in reading has received renewed interest. Some researchers have attempted to relate it to achievement. Others have concentrated on developing instruments that are practical and reliable.

The purpose of this study is to determine if reading clinics, already responsible for assessing their subjects, attempt to measure attitudes toward reading and by what methods they do so.

IV DEFINITIONS

Reading Attitude

A common definition of attitude that has been applied to reading states: "An attitude is a mental and neutral state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's

response to all objects and situations with which it is related " (Summers, 1977).

V ASSUMPTIONS

It is assumed that those representatives of surveyed clinics will respond truthfully and accurately.

VI LIMITATIONS

The survey data of this study is limited to reading clinics of colleges and universities in the forty-eight continental United States.

VII DELIMITATIONS

The results of this survey are not to be extended beyond the sample population, that is, clinics responding to the survey.

CHAPTER II - REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The subject of measuring reading attitude has been a controversial one because research has often yielded conflicting results. This problem has been due in part to an inability to agree upon a definition of attitude under which research may be done. Summers (1977) stated that the problem was due in part to "...a lack of empirical support for theoretical and operational definitions in current attitudinal measurement in reading." It was also stated that many instruments have been hampered by statistical problems and restricted applicability.

Despite such problems, research has continued. In an effort to promote his own attitude measure, Estes (1972) has stated that those in the field who believe attitude cannot be quantifiably measured are simply incorrect. His belief is that the affect is so important to the reading process that it must be and can indeed be measured.

Much of the research has involved the development of practical measures that would be reliable and valid. Work has been done at the elementary and secondary levels and has employed a variety of testing techniques. Each of the authors cited describes a reliable instrument. It remains an irony though that many also reported a lack of reliable instruments available when their work was begun. This would tend to support Summers (1977) statement above that many

tests have restricted use and questionable statistics.

Estes (1971) developed a Likert scale of twenty-eight items. It was used with 283 pupils in grades three to twelve. He reported reliability coefficients of r= .92 for grades three to six and r= .96 for grades seven to twelve.

Dulin and Chester (1974) attempted to validate the Estes scale. Their sample was more restricted as it included only 140 eleventh graders. The Estes scale was administered along with two external criterion measures, the students' self-ratings and teacher ratings. Student ratings and their Estes' scores were found to have a significant correlation or r=.60 at the .001 level of confidence. Teacher ratings and the students' Estes scores reported correlations of r= .40 and better at the .001 level. Different attitude groups were then established using all three measures and t and f tests were used to determine if there was indeed a significant difference between these attitudes. Data indicated a significant difference with F= 19.4 at the .01 level of confidence. Hence the authors concluded that the Estes scale was valid with regard to the two criterion measures used in this study.

Rowell (1972) developed a scale of sixteen items. It was used with 115 fourth and fifth graders. An interrater reliability yielded a mean coefficient of r= .88. One interesting part of this study was the explicit desire to include observer responses as well as student responses to

the items.

Askov (1972) created an instrument for use in the elementary grades. Her paired comparison format was used with 422 first and third graders. She reported reliability coefficients of r= .83-.90 when adjusted for length.

Gertrude Bullen (1972) worked with a multivariate measure for grades one to six. The study included 291 students from Fall River, Massachusetts. Admittedly, the test was short as reliability figures were reported with r= .70-.82 for grades three to six and r= .46-.53 for grades one and two.

Another multidimensional test was developed by Redelheim (1976), This instrument was designed for kindergarten through second grade, as 111 students were tested in suburban Atlanta. The test titled, Children's Attitude Toward Reading Test (CHART), used photographs exclusively. It was reported to be a reliable instrument with internal consistency reliability coefficients of r= .94, .86 and .82 in the kindergarten, first and second grades, respectively. Additional data using a test-retest method yielded reliability figures of r= .65, .78 and .79, respectively.

Using perhaps one of the largest sample populations to measure reading attitude, Deck and Jackson (1976) tested 4,093 children in Pennsylvania. They found a reliability range of r= .85-.90.

Lewis (1979) developed a scale for elementary pupils

by revising the 1971 Estes scale. His work involved 214 third, fourth and fifth graders from two schools in rural southern Minnesota. Reliability data here were stated as r= .75 for the third grade and r= .69 and .72 for the fourth and fifth grades respectively.

On the secondary level, Tullock-Rhody and Alexander (1980) developed a rating scale measure and tested it on 204 students in grades seven through twelve. They reported a test-retest reliability of r= .84 and recommended its usage in a similar urban setting with a range of ability and differing socioeconomic status.

Current research has gone beyond establishing reliable measures. It has also attempted to relate attitude to other factors in the educational and personal lives of students. In these studies conflicts can also be seen.

One early study involved a comparison of attitudes between first graders instructed in I/T/A and T/O. Using the Indiana State University Laboratory school, DuBois (1971) tested first graders and second through fifth graders who had been through the program. A test was done on the mean score of the sixty children in the I/T/A program and the 195 children in the T/O program. Although no statistical data was reported, the author found no significant difference between the groups with regard to attitude.

George Phelan (1975) chose another controversial factor by comparing attitudes toward reading and television

in fifth graders. This study included 124 white, middle class, suburban fifth graders of all reading ability levels. His survey results regarding school work in general indicate that television had a minimal effect on the school work of these children. However, attitudes toward reading may be more clearly seen in such statements as: "The children saw television as more fun and more desirable than reading." They also preferred to see a story presented on the television rather than read it in book form.

In her doctoral dissertation, Hall (1978) investigated the relationship between social class and reading attitude. Three hundred and fourteen fifth graders from rural and urban East Tennessee were tested with the Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Position. F tests were then done on the data. The author reported that in general reading attitudes became more positive as socioeconomic status moved from lower to higher levels.

The most common factor to be paired with attitude has been achievement or success in reading. Askov (1972), Deck and Jackson (1976), mentioned above, both performed correlational studies using attitude and achievement. Askov reported a significant correlation of .20 at the .01 level of confidence between attitude scores and paragraph meaning subtest scores. Deck and Jackson (1976) correlated attitude and reading scores from the subscale of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Conversely they found an inconsistent

correlation ranging from -.22 to .32.

Roettger (1979) in a study of 697 students in grades one through six attempted to correlate attitude and achievement as measured by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. He reported a low yet significant correlation of .317 at the .0001 level of confidence. This was interpreted by the author as either a problem with the instrument or as a challenge to the assumptions regarding attitude and achievement.

In a similar study, Lewis (1980) tested 149 students in grades three, four and five. This work attempted to correlate scores from an attitude inventory with subtest scores of reading from the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. The results indicated an r= .17 at the .05 level. This was reported as significant but, "...the low magnitude of the correlation limits the practical significance of the finding."

Other studies have looked into the background of the students using behavioral characteristics as a means of comparison. Scott (1980) administered three attitude measures to fifty inner-city eighth and ninth graders, forty-eight of whom were black. Personal and background information was obtained from school records. This study was designed to describe and compare at length a number of characteristics and factors concerning the affective domain of the selected students. Data were analyzed in a descriptive manner and

students were placed at various stages of attitude development in accordance with Krathwohl's taxonomy. Conclusions stated that students at higher attitude levels had better conduct, received higher grades and used more consistent strategies for attacking unknown words. Such conclusions seemed to contradict the inability of researchers to establish consistently significant relationships between attitude and performance. The fact that this study used descriptive data rather than statistical data may account in part for the contradiction.

Studies such as these suggest that attitude may effect or be affected by many factors in the educational and personal lives of students. Brown (1979) tried to identify which if any, of eight dimensions of reading would show significant developmental changes across grades four, five and six. Her sample group consisted of 431 students from Columbus, Ohio, of which 392 were black. The survey, orally administered, found five of eight dimensions showed a significant change. One key attitude dimension though, reading for enjoyment, was not seen as significant. Data revealed an F ratio of 1.69 was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Perhaps the only conclusion worth noting in this case is that in a general sense, reading attitude is subject to change.

Using the same eight dimensions, Wallbrown et al, (1979) tried to determine which of the dimensions would be

most helpful in discriminating between the feelings of normal and disabled readers. This study done in the rural mountains of North Carolina used eighty children making normal progress in reading and 116 children receiving remedial instruction. Results showed that three dimensions indicated a significant difference between the two groups. The dimensions and their data were as follows: Expressed reading difficulty $F= 20.8$, $p<.001$; Reading group (the way students viewed their reading group at school) $F= 19.3$, $p<.001$; Reading as enjoyment $F= 3.4$, $p<.05$.

The authors believe that there is a significant difference between the attitudes of normal and the attitudes of disabled readers. They are careful though not to generalize beyond their own sample of white Appalachian children.

Finally, Ransbury (1973) attempted to compare the perception of children with the perceptions of their parents and teachers. Her question was presented as such: "What behaviors are perceived by children, teachers and parents as indicative of reading attitude?" This work involved interviewing sixty, fifth and sixth graders, their parents and their teachers. The general result reported that the three groups did not share the same perceptions. The children saw conscious, verbal statements about reading as indicative of attitude, while parents saw the frequency of reading and the type of materials used as prime factors. Teachers,

interestingly enough, saw ability as the significant indicator of reading attitude!

All of the above studies have perhaps one thing in common: their conflicting results or generalizations indicate a need for further research in the subject of reading attitude. Such research should continue to include a clear definition, developing reliable instruments to measure it, and a discussion of related factors.

CHAPTER III - DESIGN OF THE STUDY

I PROCEDURES USED

This study was conducted through the use of a survey. The survey was designed to determine the methods by which reading clinics assess attitudes toward reading and to solicit their ideas about the subject of measuring reading attitudes in general.

The survey was sent to 110 directors of reading clinics in colleges and universities in the United States. The sample included thirty-one (28.2%) colleges in the northeast, thirty-one (28.2%) schools in the southeast, twenty-seven (24.6%) schools in the mid-south, sixteen (14.5%) schools in the midwest and five (4.5%) schools in western United States. Twenty-two (20%) of the colleges and universities were privately or independently operated and eighty-eight (80%) were state institutions. The surveys were sent during the month of January, 1982, and were returned during January and February, 1982. Fifty-five (50%) of the institutions responded. Data were compiled and analyzed to determine percentages in each of the categories and items in the survey. Additional comments were grouped separately.

II DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA-GATHERING INSTRUMENT

The survey included four major categories and a total

of twenty-seven items. The first category, Inferred Assessments, contained eight items and was designed to determine if measurement of reading attitudes was accomplished through indirect means such as book counts and observations. The second category, Direct Assessments, included five items and was designed to determine if standardized tests or clinic constructed tests were used in the assessment procedures.

The third category, Instruments Used, included nine items and was designed to determine more precisely the type of assessment method and instrument used in measuring reading attitudes. Examples of such methods include: pictoral, written, and interview types, rating scales, etc. Simonsen (1979) in a study of attitude measurement, described several approaches and strategies used in attitude assessment. Zirkel and Greene (1976) reviewed measurements of attitudes toward reading and examined several types of instrumentation. The items and categories of the survey were adapted from these sources.

The responses to the questions were recorded on a five-point scale. The scale included:

1	2	3	4	5
never	rarely	sometimes	usually	always

The fourth category included in this survey, Beliefs About Reading Attitudes, was designed to solicit ideas of the respondents about the measurement of reading attitudes, and included five statements. The statements represent specific beliefs or positions about the subject of measuring

reading attitudes. Epstein (1973), in a discussion of the issue of reading attitudes, stated some beliefs commonly held in this area. The statements used in this survey were adapted from this source.

Using a five-point scale, respondents were asked to agree of disagree with the items in this category. The scale included:

1	2	3	4	5
strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree

Upon completion of the study, results were sent to those participants who requested them.

CHAPTER IV - PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data results yielded information regarding reading attitude assessment practices. Upon comparing inferred and direct assessments, it was found that inferred assessments were used more often than direct means. Multiple observations rather than a single observation by the clinician were most often used as a measure of the student's reading attitude. Twenty-six (45.5%) of the clinic directors responding to the survey reported always using this practice, while an additional fourteen (25.5%) usually used clincian observations. In addition to this, seven (12.7%) reported always using books independently read by students in clinic sessions as a measure of reading attitude, while another twenty (36.4%) reported usually using this procedure. Overall, these findings indicated that a majority of clinics attempt to assess attitude by observing the behavior of the student.

The use of direct assessments or standardized tests to measure reading attitude was considerably lower than that of the other assessment procedures. Only one (1.8%) reported always using a standardized test, while only another seven (12.7%) usually use such tests. In a related finding, thirteen (23.6%) of the clinic directors reported the use of their own clinic-constructed instrument, however, none of these stated that reliabiltiy data were available for these instruments.

Of the clinics that used standardized tests occasionally, ten reported using the Estes Reading Attitude Scale, three listed the Heathington Scale and two clinics listed the San Diego Scale. (A complete list of tests reported to be in use is provided in Section B of Table I.)

The data regarding standardized test use seemed to be consistent with that found in section D of Table I. It was found that seventeen (30.9%) strongly agreed and thirty (54.5%) agreed that few reliable instruments were available to assess reading attitude. This would appear to account for the very low number of clinic directors that reported using standardized tests.

Recent research in this field has involved the attempts to create reliable and valid instruments. The fact that only one (1.8%) of the respondents always used standardized tests may indicate that clinics are currently unaware of these developments or still feel that such instruments are of little use in assessing reading attitudes.

Findings from Section C of Table I indicated the types of instruments used. Self-reporting instruments allow the student the opportunity to state their attitudes toward reading. Such reports may take several forms. The pictoral type has generally been used with younger students. It was interesting to find that none of the responding clinic directors always used a pictoral type instrument. It was found though that six (10.9%) usually use this type. This

may indeed reflect the age factor or indicate that clinics see more students in higher grades. However, it was also found that eleven (20%) always used a verbal interview, while an additional twenty-four (43.6%) usually used the verbal interview with students. This procedure was used more often than the pictoral type and more often than the written and rating scales types, which were always used by five (9%) and by four (7.3%) respectively.

It was obvious from these findings that when student self-reports were used, the responding clinic directors preferred allowing the students to talk about their attitudes toward reading. The general results of self-reporting usage was once again consistent with the beliefs about attitude assessment, as reported in Section D of Table I. It was found that twenty-nine (52.7%) disagreed and five (9.1%) strongly disagreed that attitude may only be assessed by observing changes in behaviors while reading. It was apparently believed that attitude assessment may be adequately determined by student self-reports.

Overall findings indicated that reading attitudes were reportedly being assessed by a considerable number of clinic directors responding to the survey. Inferred assessments such as observations and number of books read were used more frequently than standardized instruments. Self-reporting was also used, especially verbal interviews.

In general, these findings were consistent with the belief that assessment is necessary as only two (3.6%) strongly agreed that assessment of reading attitude was not necessary, believing that successful instruction would automatically improve attitudes toward reading. These findings also indicated a trend to use non-standardized measures, perhaps reflecting the strong agreement (seventeen or 30.9%) that a consensus about a definition of reading attitude does not exist.

TABLE I

READING ATTITUDE SURVEY DATA N = 55

A. INFERRED ASSESSMENTS	number of responses	1 never	2 rarely	3 some-times	4 usually	5 always
1. a. books independently read by students in clinic sessions	53	10.91% 6	12.73% 7	23.64% 13	36.36% 20	12.73% 7
b. library attendances	48	30.91% 17	23.64% 13	10.91% 6	16.36% 9	5.45% 3
c. observations by clinicians	53	5.45% 3	5.45% 3	14.55% 8	25.45% 14	45.45% 26
d. observations by parents	51	14.55% 8	3.64% 2	34.55% 19	14.55% 8	25.45% 14
e. observations by teachers	49	7.27% 4	10.91% 6	30.91% 17	20.0% 11	20.0% 11
2. a. single observation	25	10.91% 6	18.18% 10	7.27% 4	3.64% 2	5.45% 3
b. multiple observations	49	—	—	10.91% 6	34.55% 19	43.64% 24

TABLE I - CONTINUED

B. DIRECT ASSESSMENTS

	number of responses	1 never	2 rarely	3 sometimes	4 usually	5 always
1. use of published(standardized)tests	50	30.91% 17	29.09% 16	16.36% 9	12.73% 7	1.82% 1
2. reliability data availibility	33	20.0% 11	20.0% 11	9.09% 5	7.27% 4	3.64% 2
3. names of tests used*						
4. use of clinic-constructed instrument	52	41.82% 23	1.82% 1	18.18% 10	9.09% 5	23.64% 13
5. reliability data for clinic-constructed instrument	53	54.55% 30	3.64% 2	1.82% 1	—	—

* Estes Attitude Scale(10); Heathington Scale(3); San Diego Scale(2); Burke Inventory; Strang's Incomplete Sentences; McWilliams and Rakes; Dulin-Chester;Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes-Brown-Holtzman; Snoopy Reading Attitude Survey; Interest Inventory(adapted from Witty, Sizemore, Cooner and Kinnella, U.S.Office of Education Interest Survey); Right to Read Attitude Inventory developed by Georgia Right to Read; Journal of Reading(published but not statistically reliable); Kendall-Hunt Content Inventories; Attitude Survey by Kathy Herzog of Moorehead State University(field test)

TABLE I - CONTINUED

C. INSTRUMENTS USED	number of responses	1 never	2 rarely	3 some-times	4 usually	5 always
1. student self-reporting instruments	24	12.73% 7	1.82% 1	12.73% 7	12.73% 7	3.64% 2
a. pictoral type	32	21.82% 12	9.09% 5	16.36% 9	10.91% 6	—
b. written type	44	10.91% 6	3.64% 2	29.09% 16	27.27% 15	9.09% 5
c. verbal interviews	49	3.64% 2	3.64% 2	18.18% 10	43.64% 24	20.0% 11
d. written rating scales (e.g. Likert scales)	38	21.82% 12	14.55% 8	16.36% 9	9.09% 5	7.27% 4
2. reports of others(observable)	20	9.01% 5	1.82% 1	10.91% 6	10.91% 6	3.64% 2
a. clinician rating	45	7.27% 4	3.64% 2	27.27% 15	14.55% 8	29.09% 16
b. parent rating	43	14.55% 8	5.45% 3	32.73% 18	16.36% 9	9.01% 5

c. other- teacher(15); psychologist; counselor; clinic director; librarian; student self-rating(2)

TABLE I - CONTINUED

D. BELIEFS ABOUT READING ATTITUDE	number of responses	1 strongly agree	2 agree	3 undecided	4 disagree	5 strongly disagree
1. There is not a consensus about an adequate definition of reading attitude.	55	30.9% 17	49.09% 27	10.9% 6	9.09% 5	—
2. There is minimal correlation between attitude and achievement.	53	3.64% 2	7.27% 4	1.82% 1	58.18% 32	25.45% 14
3. Few reliable instruments are available.	55	30.90% 17	54.54% 30	14.54% 8	—	—
4. Attitude may only be assessed by observing changes in behaviors while reading.	55	10.9% 6	10.9% 6	16.36% 9	52.72% 29	9.09% 5
5. Attitude assessment is not necessary, since successful instruction automatically improves attitude.	53	3.64% 2	3.64% 2	12.73% 7	45.45% 25	30.91% 17

CHAPTER V - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to determine if college and university reading clinics assess attitudes toward reading of students enrolled in clinical sessions, and the methods being used in such assessments. The hypothesis was that fifty per cent of reading clinics do not attempt to assess the reading attitudes of their subjects.

II DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES USED

A survey was constructed and sent to 110 directors of college and university reading clinics. Questions were designed to gather information regarding the assessment procedures of reading attitudes being used in these clinics, and to elicit their ideas about the issue of measuring reading attitudes in general. Fifty-five (50%) of the institutions responded and data were compiled and analyzed to determine percentages of each of the items included in the survey.

III PRINCIPLE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

It was found that attitudes toward reading were being assessed through inferred methods by a majority of clinics. Seven (12.7%) reported always using books independently read by students as a measure, while twenty (36.4%) reported

usually using this method. The inferred assessment procedure most frequently used was the observation of the clinician. Twenty-six (45.5%) were found to always use this as a measure of reading attitude.

Other results included the finding that only a small percentage (1.8%) made use of a standardized measure all of the time. A related finding showed that more than half (54.5%) of the clinics responding agreed that few reliable instruments were available to assess reading attitude.

The dominant type of instrument in use appeared to be student self-reporting types with twenty-four (43.6%) usually using a verbal interview and an additional eleven (20%) always using one. A related finding here indicated that more than half (52.7%) disagreed that attitude can only be assessed by observing changes in reading behaviors. Apparently it was acceptable for students to report on their attitudes in a more subjective manner.

Such findings must lead one to reject the hypothesis of this study that fifty per cent of reading clinics do not attempt to assess reading attitude. When all types of reading attitudes are included and both direct and indirect methods of assessment are considered, then it is obvious that more than fifty per cent of the reading clinics surveyed do indeed attempt to assess reading attitude. It may also be stated though that statistical and reliable methods were used the least, as clinics favored more

subjective and inferential techniques.

The focus of the current research about reading attitudes indicates a trend toward the development and use of statistically reliable and valid measures. While success has been claimed by those who have developed such reading attitude tests, the perception that few reliable instruments exist may hamper their use and application. The imprecise nature of assessment measures adds to the problem of research and application, especially in the area of statistical relaibiltiy and validity. Since attitude is a construct it is more difficult to quantify and measure. Survey results indicated that a considerable number recognize that there is not a consensus regarding a definition of reading attitude. About one-half and one third of the respondents agree and strongly agree respectively that such a consensus does not exist. However, as evidenced by specific items in the survey and the results in general, a considerable number of clinic directors regard reading attitudes as important enough to measure in some manner, regardless of the problems and controversies surrounding this entire issue.

IV RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

While the results of this survey might indicate certain practices, beliefs, or trends in the area of reading attitude assessment, it is recommended that further research

be conducted using a larger sample. It would also be advantageous to consider the issue of standardization of attitude measurement. Additional research might extend to the development and application of valid and reliable instruments in the subject of reading attitude.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Askov, Eunice. "Assessment of Attitudes Toward Reading in Primary Pupils. Technical Report No. 206." ERIC ED 070 068 (January 1972).

Brown, Dorothea et al. "Developmental Changes in Reading Attitudes During the Intermediate Grades." Journal of Experimental Education 47 (Spring 1972), 259-262.

Bullen, Gertrude F. "Development and Validation of a Reading Attitude Measure for Elementary School Children, Final Report." ERIC ED 109 211 (September 1972).

Deck, Dennis and Barnette J. Jackson. "Measuring Attitudes Toward Reading in Large Scale Assessment." ERIC ED 128 407 (April 1976).

DuBois, Jessie. "A Comparison of Reading Attitudes Between First Grade Reading Instruction In I/T/A and T/O." Contemporary Education 42 (Fall 1971), 169-172.

Dulin, Kenneth and Robert Chester. "A Validation Study of the Estes Attitude Scale." Journal of Reading 18 (October 1974), 56-59.

Epstein, Ira. "Measuring Attitudes Toward Reading." ERIC ED 196 938 (November 1980).

Estes, Thomas H. "A Scale to Measure Attitudes Towards Reading." Journal of Reading 15 (November 1971), 135-139.

_____. "Assessing Attitudes Toward Reading." ERIC ED 063 077 (May 1972).

Hall, Diane Sprawls. The Relationship of Reading Attitudes to Achievement, Sex, and Social Class Among Fifth Grade Pupils. Doctoral Dissertation. Tennessee: The University of Tennessee, 1977. Abstract. Dissertation Abstracts 38: 7113-A No. 12, 1978.

Koe, F.T. "Attitudes Toward Reading." Elementary English 52 (March 1975), 342, 366.

Lewis, John. "A Reading Attitude Inventory for Elementary School Pupils." Educational and Psychological Measurement 39 (Summer 1979), 511-513.

_____. "The Relationship Between Attitude Toward Reading and Reading Success." Educational and Psychological Measurement 40 (Spring 1980), 261-262.

Phelan, George Jr. and John D. Starkey. "A Survey of Certain Attitudes Toward Reading and Television in Fifth Graders." ERIC ED 125 603 (1975).

Ransbury, Molly Kayes. "An Assessment of Reading Attitude." Journal of Reading 17 (October 1973), 25-28.

Redelheim, Paul S. "A Multidimensional Test of Reading Attitude for Children." Reading Teacher 30 (November 1976), 181-186.

Roettger, D. et al. "Validation of a Reading Attitude Scale for Elementary Students and an Investigation of the Relationship Between Attitude and Achievement." Journal of Educational Research 72 (January/February 1979), 138-142.

Rowell, C. Glennon. "An Attitude Scale for Reading." Reading Teacher 25 (Fall 1972), 442-447.

Scott, Shirley Ann. "An Investigation of Some Characteristics of Selected Eighth and Ninth Graders at Different Stages in Reading Attitude Development." ERIC ED 195 935 (1980).

Simonsen, Michael. "Attitude Measurement: Why and How." Educational Technology (September 1979), 34-38.

Stott, D.H. "Some Less Cognitive Aspects of Learning to Read." Reading Teacher 26 (January 1973), 374-383.

Summers, E.G. "Instruments for Assessing Reading Attitudes: A Review of Research and Bibliography." Journal of Reading Behavior 9 (Summer 1977), 137-65.

Tullock-Rhody, R. and J. Estill Alexander. "A Scale for Assessing Attitudes Toward Reading in Secondary Schools." Journal of Reading 23 (April 1980), 609-614.

Wallbrown, Fred et al. "Discriminating Between Attitudes Expressed by Normal and Disabled Readers." Psychology in the Schools 16 (October 1979), 472-477.

Zirkel, P.A. and J.F. Greene. "Measurement of Attitudes Toward Reading in the Elementary Grades: A Review." Reading World 16 (December 1976), 104-113.

APPENDIX

SURVEY OF READING ATTITUDE ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

A. INFERRED ASSESSMENTS	1 never	2 rarely	3 some-times	4 usually	5 always
1. Does your clinic assess attitude through the use of:					
a. books independently read by students in clinic sessions					
b. library attendances					
c. observations by clinicians					
d. observations by parents					
e. observations by teachers					
f. other_____					
2. If observations are used, do you use:					
a. single observation					
b. multiple observations					
B. DIRECT ASSESSMENTS					
1. Does your clinic use published reading attitude instruments?					
2. Is reliabiltiy data available?					
3. If used, would you please identify some of these:					

_____

_____

	1 never	2 rarely	3 some-times	4 usually	5 always
4. Has your clinic constructed its own reading attitude instrument?					
5. If so, does this instrument have reliability data available?					
C. INSTRUMENTS USED Does your clinic assess attitude by using:					
1. student self-reporting instruments?					
a. pictoral type					
b. written type					
c. verbal interviews					
d. written rating scales (e.g. Likert scale)					
2. reports of others(observable)?					
a. clinician rating					
b. parent rating					
c. other_____					

D. BELIEFS ABOUT READING ATTITUDE

Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statements

	1 strongly agree	2 agree	3 undecided	4 disagree	5 strongly disagree
1. There is not a consensus about an adequate definition of reading attitude.					
2. There is minimal correlation between attitude and achievement.					
3. Few reliable instruments are available.					
4. Attitude may only be assessed by observing changes in behaviors while reading.					
5. Attitude assessment is not necessary, since successful instruction automatically improves attitude.					

I would like to receive a summary of the results of this survey _____yes _____no

Please return to: Mr. Alan Ramey
3 Bluff St.
Cranford, New Jersey 07016